

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 CORTEZ DAUNDRE JONES,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 CITY OF SEATTLE, et al.,

12 Defendants.

Case No. C23-1153RSM

Case No. C23-1162RSM

Case No. C23-1184RSM

Case No. C23-1185RSM

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND  
DENYING SECOND MOTIONS FOR  
LEAVE TO PROCEED IFP

13 So far this month *pro se* Plaintiff Cortez Daundre Jones has filed 37 cases against  
14 various government and private entities. In each case Mr. Jones attempts to proceed *in forma*  
15 *pauperis* (“IFP”). Four such cases have been assigned to the undersigned judge. Each begins  
16 with an IFP application indicating that Mr. Jones has an annual salary of “\$35,000.00” and  
17 “\$324,000” in “Fidelity Investment Stocks.” Dkt. #1. All of these applications are signed by  
18 Mr. Jones under penalty of perjury.

19 Each case has a Report and Recommendation from a magistrate judge recommending  
20 denial of IFP on the basis that Mr. Jones clearly has the financial resources to pay the filing fee.  
21 In response to those R&Rs, Mr. Jones has filed Amended Motions for Leave to Proceed In  
22 Forma Pauperis. *See* Case No. C23-1153RSM, Dkt. #8; Case No. C23-1162RSM, Dkt. #7; Case  
23 No. C23-1185RSM, Dkt. #7. Each Motion has an IFP application that now lists Mr. Jones’s  
24

1 income as “0” and his assets as “0.” *Id.* In fact, a “0” is written in every dollar field. They are  
2 clearly photocopies of each other with all the signatures and text identical, except with the  
3 unique Defendants and case numbers written in after. These IFP applications are also signed by  
4 Mr. Jones under penalty of perjury.

5 Mr. Jones provides no explanation for how he suddenly lost over \$300,000 in assets or  
6 his annual salary of \$35,000.00. The Court finds that Mr. Jones has submitted a false IFP  
7 application in each case—either the first application or, far more likely, the second. The Court  
8 agrees with the reasoning of the R&R in each case and finds that Mr. Jones must pay the filing  
9 fee if he wishes to proceed in each case.

10 The Court, having reviewed the Report and Recommendations of Magistrate Judges S.  
11 Kate Vaughan, Michelle L. Peterson, and Brian A. Tsuchida, and the remaining record, hereby  
12 FINDS and ORDERS:

13 (1) The Court ADOPTS the following Report and Recommendations:

- 14 a. Case No. C23-1153RSM, Dkt. #5;
- 15 b. Case No. C23-1162RSM, Dkt. #3;
- 16 c. Case No. C23-1184RSM, Dkt. #2;
- 17 d. Case No. C23-1185RSM, Dkt. #4.

18 All of Plaintiff’s Motions to Proceed IFP are DENIED. The Court will not entertain  
19 any further IFP Motions from Mr. Jones. Plaintiff is directed to pay the full filing fee of  
20 \$402.00 in each case within thirty (30) days of the date of signature below. If the filing  
21 fee is not paid, each case will be dismissed.

22 (2) The Report and Recommendation in Case No. C23-1184RSM, Dkt. #9, is  
23 STRICKEN AS MOOT.

1 (3) The Clerk shall file the complaint in each case only on receipt of the filing fee. If no  
2 filing fee is paid within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order, the Clerk is  
3 directed to close the file.

4 (4) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to the parties and to the Magistrate  
5 Judge in each case.

6 DATED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2023.

7  
8 

9 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24